

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

GWENDOLYN MARIE WILSON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CIV 00-252 BB/LCS

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is a civil rights action brought by the *pro se* plaintiff. Plaintiff applied for and was granted leave by the Court to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Consequently, review of Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915 is appropriate.

The Court is required to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* complaint *sua sponte* under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B) if the Court determines that the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. In reviewing a *pro se* plaintiff's complaint and the amended complaint, the Court applies the same legal standards applicable to pleadings drafted by counsel, but is at the same time mindful that the complaint must be liberally construed. Northington v. Jackson, 973 F.2d 1518, 1520-21 (10th Cir. 1992).

On June 6, 2000, this Court reviewed the plaintiff's "Petition for Injunction," filed June 2, 2000, as well as her initial complaint, filed February 22, 2000. In the complaint, Plaintiff makes conclusory and incoherent allegations of actions by the Social Security Administration, former landlords, airlines, and insurance companies. The "Petition for Injunction" was similarly defective and was denied, but the Court granted Plaintiff until June 16, 2000 to file an amended complaint. In

g

its order allowing the amendment, this Court directed the plaintiff to set forth her claims in simple, plain English so that the Court could understand the basis of her complaint. Plaintiff filed her amended complaint on June 14, 2000, but it too fails to allege any actions which rise to the level of a constitutional claim. Further, Plaintiff fails to state any cognizable claim at all.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's amended complaint is dismissed sua sponte pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (iii) and this case is dismissed.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE